

E

440

.T8



THE CAMPAIGN IN ILLINOIS.

SPEECH OF SENATOR TRUMBULL, AT CHICAGO.

HIS PRIVATE OPINION OF DOUGLAS PUBLICLY EXPRESSED.

[From the Chicago Democrat.]

Upon being introduced, Mr. Trumbull was greeted with three hearty cheers. Silence having been restored, he said :

Fellow-citizens : I am gratified to have an opportunity of laying before so many of my fellow-citizens as I see here assembled, my views in regard to the political questions which have agitated the public mind since I became connected with public affairs. When I entered Congress as one of the representatives of this state, the great and all-absorbing question which occupied the public mind was the slavery question. Parties were then organized upon that question, and they have continued so up to this time ; and it is in regard to that question that I shall chiefly address you to-night, though not altogether ; for, in discussing that question I desire to bring before you the fact which exists that all the great powers of this government are subordinate to this one question. I wish to show you how the expenditures of this government are made, how its patronage is used, and how its power is exerted for the purpose of encouraging the spread of slavery and the domination of the slave power. [Applause.] In doing this, my fellow-citizens, I shall resort to no clap-trap expressions. I wish no person in this audience, or in this state, to act or vote with that party with which I have the honor to act, unless he believes it to be right. I have no false colors to hang out to deceive you, but I wish to lay before you the plain, honest truth, and if that does not commend the party with which I act to your judgments, then I say to you it is your duty to act with some other party ; but if, in the course of the observations I have to make, I can show that a party sailing under false colors, pretending one thing and acting another, is

misleading the public mind and changing the policy of the government—professing economy, is guilty of profligacy—professing to love the constitution, is trampling it under foot—and, professing to be democratic, is the old black cockade federal party in disguise—if I can show this to you, then I trust you will abandon such a party as that.

HISTORY AND PROGRESS OF SLAVERY IN THE TERRITORIES.

It will be necessary to devote a few moments—and I shall be very brief upon that point—to a history of the slavery question. This is necessary, because parties dispute as to what each professes. Each of the great parties of the country profess devotion to the constitution, and each charges upon the other the entertaining of views which it denies. When such is the case we must look at the facts, and, as intelligent men, you must judge who is right. When the government was formed we all know that slavery existed in many of the states, and the government was formed upon the principle of letting the slavery question alone, to be managed by the states in which it existed. But, so far as the federal government was concerned, it took cognizance of this question in the territories belonging to the United States. This is a matter of history. Before the adoption of this constitution the territories which had been ceded to the United States as they existed under the articles of the confederation, were governed by what was known as the ordinance of 1787, and that ordinance, as you well know, excluded slavery from all the territory which then belonged to the United States. When the constitution was formed, shortly afterward, this subject was left in the same condition in which the convention found it. And now I wish you to bear in mind the distinction between a state and territory—for a great deal of the confusion and difficulty which has arisen in the country in regard to this question is by confounding states with territories. The whole question which now divides parties relates to the government of the territories, not states at all. And they who seek to con-

found the two together must have some object to confuse the public mind. This policy continued to exclude slavery from all the territories of the United States for many years. When North Carolina and Georgia ceded the western territory belonging to those states to the United States, it was so well understood that the federal government would abolish slavery in the territories which they ceded, unless there was a provision against it, that such a clause was inserted in the deed of cession. In 1803, when we acquired Louisiana, slavery existed there. It remained, and Louisiana was admitted as a slave state. And when Missouri came to be admitted, in 1820, it was admitted on condition that the balance of the territory lying north of 36 degrees 30 minutes north latitude should remain free while it was a territory.—There has been a great deal of confusion in the public mind in regard to the meaning of the Missouri Compromise. That Compromise, or the clause of it in controversy, read something like this: "That in all territory north of thirty-six degrees thirty minutes north latitude, slavery or involuntary servitude, except as a penalty for crime, shall be and is hereby forever prohibited." Much stress has been laid, by those who seek to mislead the public mind, upon the word "forever." This word "forever" makes the sentence a little more emphatic, but it gives to it no other meaning, in a legal point of view, than it would have had if this word had been omitted. The Missouri Compromise related to that territory so long as it remained a territory, but not a moment afterwards. It had no application to the country when admitted as a state, nor does any law Congress may pass for the government of a territory have operation one moment after that territory is admitted as a state. [Applause.] What was the object of repealing the Missouri Compromise? Was it to give the people, when they came to form a state government, the right to have slavery or not? Why, they had it without such repeal—[a voice—"That's so!"]—just as perfectly as they had it after its repeal, because that provision of the law ceased to operate the moment the territory ceased to exist in a territorial condition—the moment the state was formed—just as the act organizing the territory of Minnesota, so long as it remained a territory, provided a governor and judges, and the rules for the government of its legislature; but when Minnesota was admitted as a state they were all *ipso facto* abolished. Just so in regard to the Missouri compromise. I state this on this occasion to show that some other object was designed than that which is now professed in the repeal of the Missouri compromise. The policy of the country, down to 1854, was to keep the territories free. Then a new policy was inaugurated. Now, what was the theory upon which the Missouri compromise was repealed? I will state it as fairly as I know how for the benefit of those who effected that repeal. Did they not tell us that the Missouri compromise was repealed for the purpose of conferring upon the people of the territory the right of self-government and popular sovereignty? Wasn't that the avowed reason? [Cries of "Yes, yes."] Well, if it was for that reason, has not that reason been totally abandoned? ["Yes, that's so."] It is true that was the reason, and it was said by those who brought about that repeal that the people of a territory should have the same right to regulate their domestic affairs as the people of a state, and I remember to have heard the position stated in this form: "Are you not capable of governing yourselves in the state of Illinois, and do you lose your senses, so that you can't govern yourselves the moment you pass over the line of a state into a territory? Are you not as capable of governing

yourselves there as here?" This was the form in which the question was stated, and the appeal was made to all the people of the free states to endorse the repeal of the Missouri Compromise upon this ground—and the ground alone—of leaving the people of the territory free to regulate their own domestic affairs in their own way. This was the doctrine professed until the Cincinnati Convention met in 1856; I mean professed in the North, for it never was the doctrine avowed by the South. When that convention met they passed a resolution declaring that the people of each territory should have the right to determine their domestic institutions, including slavery, when they came to form a state government. Here the idea was first started that they should have that right when they formed a state government. Was that ever in controversy? [Cries of "No! no!"] Never. Did any one ever pretend that any body could form a constitution for the people of a state except the people of the state themselves? The people of a territory cannot by themselves put a state constitution in operation. The constitution which they form has no effect—is not approved—until they are admitted into the Union as a state. You all know this. Minnesota formed a constitution, but did it come into force before she was admitted as a state? Oregon formed a constitution, and yet is not a state. Kansas has had half a dozen constitutions and is not yet a state. [Cheers and laughter.] So that this application of the doctrine of popular sovereignty to the people of a territory, in the formation of a state constitution, which no one ever disputed, was an after thought—a change of doctrine. To liken it familiarly: Suppose a man were to go about the streets proclaiming the absolute right of a child to do as he pleased; and you told him, "Sir, it will not do to let our little boys and girls do as they please; they must be governed by their parents until they have arrived at an age when they are capable of taking care of themselves," and you satisfy him that this is so, and that the best interests of the child all require that he should be under the control of his parents until he arrives at an age when he is capable of taking care of himself. After you have satisfied the man of that, who has been crying out for the rights of the child, he turns around and hurrahs for the rights of the child when he's twenty-one. [Laughter.] He cries, "I am for the rights of the child—that is, I am for the rights of the child when he gets to be a man." [Renewed laughter.] Well, what do you who hurrah for the popular sovereignty of the people of a territory mean? Do you mean that the people of a territory shall elect their own Governor? No. That they shall elect their own judges? No. Do you mean they can provide for a legislature? No. Do you mean that they may keep slavery from being introduced among them? No. Then what do you mean? "I mean when they cease to be a territory and come to be a state, and are twenty-one years of age, [laughter and cheers] they may do as they please." Here is the change the repealers of the Missouri compromise have made in their professions. They all professed at the time the Missouri compromise was repealed to believe that slavery would not go into Kansas. We who were opposed to the repeal of that law which excluded slavery from Kansas while a territory, told them the effect of it would be to open Kansas to slavery, and slavery would go there. They said it was no such thing—it was a slander upon them, for they were as much opposed to slavery as any one—it was an abolition lie—slavery would never go there, and the Missouri compromise was not repealed for any such purpose. This was the profession. [Cries of "true, true."]

What did we say further? We said slavery would be introduced, and when slavery got into the territory it would be difficult to get it out. This they denied. What has been the practical effect? The moment the Missouri compromise was repealed, slavery did go into Kansas—it is there today. That is the truth, which cannot be denied. After slavery got there, did the people have the right to exclude it? did the people have the right to do anything? You are too familiar with the history of Kansas to require that I should go over it to-night; but you all know, that so far from the people of Kansas having the right to regulate their own affairs on the subject of slavery, at the very first election which was held the settlers were driven from the polls, and a legislature was elected for them, and what did it do? The legislature passed a law punishing a man with chains and the penitentiary who should say slavery did not exist in Kansas. If a man merely avowed such to be his opinion, he subjected himself to the penitentiary. That legislature, when it met, imposed unconstitutional laws upon the people of Kansas—provided for the perpetuation of its power—appointed its officers for years—took the control of all the affairs of the territory, and, backed by the United States army, a perfect despotism was forced upon the people, who, it was said, had had conferred upon them the great principles of self-government and popular sovereignty. [Loud and continued applause.] These are the facts. Let us follow this history along a little further. In process of time it was supposed that Kansas would wish to be admitted into the Union as a state. Her people, you remember, had formed one constitution, known as the "Topeka Constitution," establishing a free state. It was necessary to meet this with something, and a bill was prepared in the Senate of the United States, by Mr. Douglas, authorizing the people of Kansas to hold a convention and form a constitution. Several amendments were offered to that bill. Among others an amendment was offered by Mr. Toombs, of Georgia, and that bill subsequently passed the Senate. Now, fellow-citizens, I make the distinct charge that there was a preconcerted arrangement and plot entered into by the very men who now claim credit for opposing a constitution not submitted to the people, to have a constitution formed and put in force without giving the people any opportunity to pass upon it. [Great applause.] This, my friends, is a serious charge, but I charge it to-night, that the very men who traverse the country, under banners proclaiming popular sovereignty, by design concocted a bill on purpose to force a constitution on the people. I have brought along with me the evidence to prove the charge I make—[applause]—because a charge of a serious character like this might be controverted by the men who claim credit for popular sovereignty unless I brought the evidence with me. I hold in my hands the bill brought into the Senate of the United States by Mr. Toombs on the 25th June, 1856, containing a clause requiring the constitution which the convention should form to be submitted to the people for their ratification or rejection. That bill was referred to the Committee on Territories in the Senate of the United States, of which Judge Douglas is chairman. Judge Douglas, five days afterwards reported back the bill I hold in my hand, making various alterations in it; among others, striking out the clause requiring its submission to the people. He stated that on consultation with Mr. Toombs, he had made these alterations. [Tremendous applause.]

A voice—To whom did he make the statement?

Mr. Trumbull—He made it in the Senate of the United States, and it is reported in the Congressional Globe; and, sir, if you are a Douglas man—

Same voice—I am, sir.

Mr. Trumbull—And you want to satisfy yourself that he was in the plot to force a constitution upon that people? I will satisfy you. [Cries of good, good; hit him again, and cheers.] I will cram the truth down any honest man's throat, until he cannot deny it. [Renewed cheers.] And to the man who does deny it, I will cram the lie down his throat, till he shall cry enough. [Tremendous cheering.] It is preposterous—it is the most damnable effrontery that man ever put on, to conceal a scheme to defraud and cheat a people out of their rights, and then claim credit for it. [Cries of "Hurrah for Trumbull—hit him again—down with all such men."] That is not all, my Douglas friend—that is not all. I, myself, humble as I am, and making no pretensions other than to have performed my duty to the best of my ability to the state that has honored me by placing me in the Senate, pointed this out two years ago. [Three cheers for Trumbull were given with great enthusiasm.] I stated that it was a little too much to call a convention in Kansas before knowing what was the wish of the people, and then to allow the fifty-two men which were to compose the convention, according to that bill, to put any sort of a constitution upon the people without allowing them to vote upon it.

A Voice—What did Douglas say to it?

Mr. Trumbull—What did he say? He was silent as the grave, and voted for the bill? [Applause.] It passed the Senate, but was defeated in the House. Mind you now, this was before the Presidential election. [Cheers and laughter.] It was before the thunders of the Fremont vote had rolled down to Washington, and frightened the men that were there. [Applause.] It was before the free people of Illinois had swept the plunders from the state capitol, and installed in their places free men, and the friends of free men. [Renewed applause.] It would not do to risk that policy much longer. [Laughter and applause.]

LECOMPTON.

The people of Kansas, it is said—or I will say, rather, the Legislature of Kansas which had been imposed upon that people—made provision, about a year ago, for calling a convention to form a constitution, and they laid their plans in such a way that they had the power in their own hands. They took a registry, or pretended to take a registry, of the voters. They made the registry so as to give themselves a majority. They apportioned the representation throughout the State, and out of thirty-five counties, to nineteen counties they gave no representation at all; all the delegates were from the other sixteen. And that convention met and adopted what is called the "Lecompton Constitution." [A voice, "That is true. I'm a Douglas man."] That constitution was a slavery constitution, in any event; it was submitted to the people in what form they would have slavery—whether the slavery which was there should be continued perpetually, or whether future slavery should be prohibited from entering the territory. A vote was taken upon the alternative proposition. Now down to this period, and the formation of the Lecompton constitution, all these outrages in Kansas—and I need not stop to repeat them, for they are familiar to you all—down to this period, they were all justified by the men who now claim credit for opposing one of the series of acts growing out of the repeal of the Missouri compromise. When this constitution was sent to Congress, the Republicans, as a matter of course, were opposed to it—they were opposed to the bogus laws from beginning to end—opposed to the usurpation; they were opposed to the despotism, and they, as a matter of course, were opposed to this Lecompton constitution—its legitimate offspring. Some

of those who had justified all the previous outrages in Kansas opposed it also, and I have heard it said that my distinguished colleague claims credit for opposing it and killing it. Why, my fellow-citizens, my colleague was brushed out of the way as you would brush away a fly. In the Senate of the United States they passed it over the heads of the Republicans with all the assistance Judge Douglas could give us. He was counselling with us, and advising with us, and attempting to devise plans by which it could be defeated, yet it went through the Senate with a decided majority, but in the House of Representatives, where the Republicans were stronger, they made a stand against it, and the question was taken on rejecting this Lecompton constitution, this fraudulent concern, and but a single so-called democrat voted against it. Major Harris, of this state, was the only one who united with the Republicans, and came up like a man and voted to reject and kill the thing forever. [Good for One man—three cheers for Harris.] Fellow-citizens, I do not mean there was but one man voted against it—I think there were ninety-five, but we got but little help from these men who claim credit for having defeated it; that is what I mean to say. The proposition was made to amend the bill, and it resulted in what you know as the English—I believe some people call it—swindle. But it is no matter what it was, the people of Kansas buried it out of sight on Monday last. [Great cheers.] Now, where are these men, who, upon that matter united with the Republicans—where are they? They say they differed with the administration upon a single measure. What was that measure? Why, it was on the adoption of the Lecompton constitution, and admitting Kansas into the Union as a state under it. Well, that was a temporary issue, and is dead, buried, past and gone forever. There is the end of it. Where are the men, then, who united with the Republicans to defeat that iniquity and fraud, who have proclaimed in loud tones that it was a swindle, and that there was an unholy attempt to force that swindle upon the people of Kansas? They have gone back and united with those men who conspired to force this constitution upon the people of Kansas against their will, (they are a singular sort of associates for honest men to pick out,) and they claim to stand with them. Now, I wish that this burying of the Lecompton constitution by the people was the end of this question, and that freedom might triumph forever afterwards. But the contest is not ended. This is but one of a series of acts adopted by this party in 1854, when the policy of the country was changed in regard to the government of the territories or the subject of slavery.

THE DESPOTISM AT WASHINGTON.

The power which was then inaugurated in using all the departments of this government, not merely to extend slavery into Kansas and bring it in as a slave state, but to make all the interests of this great country subordinate to the slave power. The despotism of Washington is almost as cruel as that which has prevailed in Kansas. There is not, holding office throughout this vast country, a single man who is known to entertain views in opposition to the right to take slaves into free territories. It is an utter disqualification for office. All the departments at Washington are organized upon the plan of proscribing men who believe that slavery should be excluded from the free territories. All the committees in Congress—or all the important ones—which mature the business for the action of Congress, are under the control of this same power. The Supreme Court is under the control of this same power. You all recollect the case which excited the whole country two years ago, when a Senator

of the United States was struck down and beaten nearly to death in his seat in the Senate Chamber, for uttering his honest sentiment in opposition to this slavery propagandism. But a worse state of things than that exists to-day. The gentleman who was thus stricken down in the vigor of manhood, and has been suffering from that day to this, and who, his best friends fear, may never recover, suffering with anguish and pain and torture, from blows inflicted upon him unawares and without notice—that gentleman, now just able to walk, has since made his appearance in the Senate Chamber, having been re-elected by the people of the state of Massachusetts, and when he comes there and rises with difficulty from his chair, two years after the act was done, for which some may plead the excuse that it was done under excitement—I say now, the very men in the interest of this power affect to treat him with contempt. [Cries of "Shame, shame."] Would you believe it? Not a northern senator belonging to this pro-slavery party dares even to speak to him lest he offend his southern associate? Yes, during the last session of Congress, when upon one occasion it was stated in the Senate that the senator from Massachusetts had paired off with some other member, who was also indisposed, a sneer of contempt was observed through the chamber at the idea of his indisposition, and the leaders of the pro-slavery democracy affect to believe that it is a pretence on the part of a man who has been suffering these two years. In my judgment the world has never seen exhibited such refined malignity and cruelty as this attempt to treat with scorn that suffering man. This is worse a thousand fold than the spirit which under excitement could strike the blow, for this is meditated and continued malice. [Loud applause.]

A Voice—Three cheers for Sumner. [The cheers were given heartily.]

I mention this, my fellow-citizens, to show the condition of things at Washington. Let me tell you another fact. I went as your representative two years ago to Washington, almost an entire stranger, never having met more than two or three members of the Senate in my life. I remained there as one of the representatives of this state through two sessions of Congress, sent there to consult with the representatives of other co-equal states for the best good of a common country, and for those two years was not placed on a committee which ever met. Republican senators were not consulted—we were ignored by this proscriptive, intolerant party, that made adhesion to the interests of the slave power the only test by which they allowed a person to take part in the proceedings of government wherever they could prevent it. A little different state of things prevailed after the Fremont election in 1856. But let me tell you how it is now. The committees were organized anew at the commencement of the last session of Congress, and I have with me a list of them. On looking at it you will find that all the leading committees are not only entirely in the interest of this pro-slavery party, but are controlled by southern men. The Committee on Foreign Relations is one of the most important. It is presided over by Mason, of Virginia, and a majority of that committee are from the southern states. The Committee on the Judiciary is presided over by Bayard, of Delaware, and a majority of that committee are from the southern states. The Committee on Naval Affairs is presided over by Mallory, of Florida, and a majority of that committee are from the southern states. The Committee on Military Affairs is presided over by Davis, of Mississippi. On Post-offices by Yulee, of Florida. The Committee on Finance by Hunter, of Virginia. Southern men are at the head of all those committees. That on Commerce is presided over by Clay, of Alabama; that on

Indian Affairs by Sebastian, of Arkansas; I believe there are one or two other committees besides that on Territories, of which Mr. Douglas is the chairman, the chairmanship of which is given to the North; perhaps the Committee on Enrolled Bills, or something of that kind. Now, the northern or free states constitute a majority, and you see how powerless they are in the business of the Senate. This is so, not only in regard to the distribution of the business of Congress, but in the appropriations. At the last session of Congress, more than three-fourths of all the money appropriated for fortifications on the Atlantic and the Gulf coast was appropriated for fortifications in slaveholding states. There are two buildings in the South erected for custom-house purposes—one at New Orleans and the other at Charleston—not yet completed, and no estimates yet furnished of what the cost of completion will be. Already more than five millions of dollars have been appropriated to build these two houses alone. There's where the money goes. The last Congress appropriated \$450,000 to continue the work upon them; and when I inquired in the Senate, of the chairman of the Committee of Finance, how much the custom-house at Charleston was to cost when completed, he replied that no estimate had been made; but the inquiry led to the disclosure of the fact that a marble palace was being built fronting on a fish market on one side, which had already cost, with the appropriation then asked, some two millions of dollars, and it would cost some three millions before it would be finished. How many men do you suppose are to occupy this building when finished? Forty-eight was the number of employes in 1857, the last year reported, and the amount of revenue collected was a little over \$500,000. [Laughter.] The so-called democracy want, for the accommodation of these forty-eight persons, and to collect \$500,000, a building to cost three millions! In the great city of New York there is a custom-house—many of you have seen it—a fine building it is, and it cost about eleven hundred thousand dollars. How many persons do you suppose are employed at the New York Custom-House, and how much revenue collected? The last year reported more than forty-two millions of dollars collected at New York, and there were more than a thousand persons employed in its collection, and a building costing a little over a million was sufficient to do the business in. Do you suppose such an appropriation as that for the Custom House at Charleston could be obtained to erect a public building in the northern states? [No, no.] The Custom House in the city of Philadelphia only cost some four or five hundred thousand dollars; that in Boston about a million, while that in New Orleans has cost more than three millions. [A voice—"And sinking at that." Laughter.] Yes, sinking at that. Like the treasury, my friends, it is based on a sandy foundation. [Renewed laughter.] While three-fourths of the money appropriated for fortification of the last session is to be expended in slave states, not a dollar was appropriated for the fortifications at the northwestern frontier. While the party can appropriate five millions to build two houses—one at Charleston and the other at New Orleans—how much money do you suppose it appropriated at the last session to save the hundreds of lives lost in sight of your city, upon this lake, and to save the millions of property that annually go down to the bottom for want of some little improvement of your great harbors? Not a dollar could be obtained for such a purpose.

THE DRED SCOTT DECISION.

Now what did this party design by the policy inaugurated in 1854? I have shown you how they

have gone on, step by step, advancing first one opinion, then another, and then another, until they have got slavery into Kansas; denying first the power of Congress to exclude it, then denying the power of the people of a territory, while in a territorial condition, to exclude it. Next, they will deny the power of the people when they form a state constitution to exclude it; and that such is the next step to be taken is manifest from the Dred Scott decision. I wish, fellow-citizens, to get before you, if I can, a clear idea of that Dred Scott decision, and what it decided in that case. The case was this: A man by the name of Dred Scott brought a suit for his freedom in the United States Court in Missouri, on the ground that he had been taken by his master to Rock Island, in this state, and there held for some time, and afterwards taken to Fort Snelling, Minnesota, which was then a territory, and a part of the Louisiana purchase, from which slavery was excluded by the Missouri compromise; and he insisted that by virtue of the laws of Illinois and the laws of the territory in which he was at Fort Snelling, he was a free man. The defence set up this plea: That Dred Scott was a negro, descended from parents who were imported from Africa and held as slaves, and being such negro he had no authority to sue in the United States courts, and, therefore, the court had no jurisdiction over the case. Now, the defendant didn't set up that Dred Scott was a slave, mind you. He said he was a negro, descended from slave parents. * * * * *

What did the Supreme Court decide? They decided that a person of the character described in the plea had no authority to bring a suit in the United States Court, and they dismissed the case for want of jurisdiction, stating the court had no authority to enter any judgment in the case, because a negro had no right to sue in that court. Now, was not that the end of the case? It ought to have been the end of it; but for political reasons the judges go on and give their opinions separately upon the authority of Congress to exclude slavery from the country in which Fort Snelling was located—which was unnecessary to the decision. The result of the case did not determine whether Dred Scott was a slave or a freeman, and the question of the authority of Congress to pass a law excluding slavery from the territory north of 36 degrees 30 minutes was not involved; because, if the negro could have derived his freedom from being in a region of country where slavery was prohibited by law, he had it by residing at Rock Island. The state of Illinois had abolished slavery, and if the fact of his having been brought within a free jurisdiction gave him freedom, he had it by residing in this state. But the judges, for political purposes, go on and express their opinions concerning the authority of Congress and a territorial legislature to pass laws excluding slavery from a territory; such opinions are extrajudicial and of no binding force. I state this for the benefit of that class of citizens who are very much disinclined to make any attack upon the decision of the court. These are the opinions of the Judges separately given upon questions not before them; and are they not to be censured for going out of the case to express such opinions? ["Yes, yes."] There is no importance in these opinions, as judicial decisions at all, and they are only important in this respect—they have been adopted by the great democratic party, so called, as a part of its creed, and Mr. Buchanan says that slavery exists in Kansas and Nebraska as effectually as it does in South Carolina and Georgia, under these opinions. Hence it becomes very important to look to the opinions of these judges, as pointing out the creed of the party which is now in power, and which they are endeavoring to perpetuate.

ing to enforce upon the country. I should have no sort of respect for such a decision, in any event. If there had been a decision of the court upon the point, when directly before them, that Congress had no authority to pass a law excluding slavery from a territory, I would have treated that decision in the particular case as binding, but I would have treated it with utter contempt as applied to any other case. I have no scruples in assailing the infallibility of the men who wear gowns, any more than I have those who wear crowns. [Cries of "Good," "good;" "that's right," and great cheers.] Despotism is despotism, whether practised by crowned heads or by men clothed in gowns. [Renewed cheers.] *I am not ashamed to appeal from the obiter dicta opinions of supreme judges subversive of the constitution. Fellow citizens, I acknowledge a power higher than Presidents, higher than Congress, higher than supreme courts, and to that power, whose name is the people, I will appeal.* [Tremendous cheering.] *The people make Presidents and courts, and when a tyrant takes possession of those they have placed in power, the people who are sovereigns and who are above all their servants, will take the power into their own hands.* ["Good," "good," "that's so."] The Supreme Court of the United States had repeatedly decided, prior to the Dred Scott case, that Congress had power to pass laws governing the territories. When it was presided over by Marshall, the court held that in the government of the territories Congress possessed the combined power of the state and the federal government. Those people who talk to us about appealing from the decision of the courts to the popular assembly, what have they done? Why, over here at Cincinnati, when they met to lay down their creed and declare what they were for, they said in so many words that Congress had no power to establish a national bank. The Supreme Court had decided that Congress had the power. Where was their reverence for it then? [Applause and laughter.] They cannot appeal from the decision of the court to the people, (the source of all power), but they can appeal to this convention in Cincinnati. And I will not undertake to describe that convention; Colonel Benton once described it. [Laughter.] I would sooner have the decision of the people than of such a set of men. But, fellow-citizens, the self-styled democracy not only set at naught a decision of the court in their party platform, but while professing general devotion to the court, and to believe that a court can do no wrong, they have made it a part of their creed that a single state has the authority to set aside the decision of the court of Congress and the Executive. Do you recollect the resolutions of Cincinnati? I believe I have them here. One of the resolutions adopted declares—

That the democratic party will faithfully abide by and uphold the principles laid down in the Kentucky and Virginia legislatures in 1798, and in the report of Mr. Madison to the Virginia legislature in 1799; that it adopts those principles as constituting one of the main foundations of its political creed, and is resolved to carry them out in their obvious meaning and import.

Do you remember what resolutions these were? They were the nullification resolutions. [Laughter.] Here is one of them. This was in the Kentucky legislature, in 1798:

Resolved, That this government, created by the compact (the constitution) was not made the exclusive or final judge of the extent of the powers delegated to itself, since that would have made its discretion, and not the constitution, the measure of its powers; but that, as in all cases of compact among parties having no common judge, each party has an equal right to judge for itself, as well of infractions, as of the mode and measure of redress.

In November, 1799, the Kentucky legislature reaffirmed the principle of these resolutions, and added the following:

That the several states who formed that instrument being sovereign and independent, have the unquestionable right to judge of the infraction; and that a nullification by those sovereignties of all unauthorized acts done under color of that instrument, is the rightful remedy.

Nullification by a state, which has the right to judge for itself of the infractions of the constitution, is the rightful remedy! Now, look at these men coming up to charge the Republican party with a great sacrilege in assailing the *obiter dicta* opinions of the Supreme Court, and at the same time pledging themselves in their party platform to the right of any state to determine at its pleasure and for itself what the constitution means, in defiance of a decision of the Supreme Court and the Executive, and to nullify an act of Congress which both sustain. ["That's it!"—"good, good."] This is the consistency they exhibit when they make such assaults upon us. But, fellow-citizens, if we are required to submit to the decisions of the Supreme Court, as to the authority of Congress to exclude slavery from a territory, and if it be true that the people of a territory have no authority, as the Judges of the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott opinion say—if the people of the territory while in a territorial condition have no power to exclude slavery from their midst, has not that Court the same right to decide whether a state may exclude slavery? Look whither this doctrine tends. If neither the Congress nor the people can exclude slavery from a territory, because the constitution of the United States is the paramount law of the land, and carries slavery with it, then the states cannot exclude slavery, because the constitution of the United States is the paramount law of the land in the states as well as the territories; and if there is anything in that instrument which extends slavery into the territories, the same provision must extend it into the states also. Well, suppose the Supreme Court decide, as they are bound to decide if they carry out the doctrine they have announced in that Dred Scott case, that by virtue of the constitution slavery is extended into all the free states of this Union, are these gentlemen prepared to submit to that? [Cries of "No, no."] You are just as much bound to submit to it as to this opinion that carries slavery into the territories, and the man who defends the one must sustain the other. That is the necessary consequence of the doctrine laid down. There is now a case pending, known as the "Lemmon case," and when the country gets prepared to receive the decision, you will probably hear again, from the Supreme Court of the United States, the doctrine announced, that under the constitution, slavery goes into all of the states of the Union. That instrument, which our fathers made for securing the blessings of liberty, is thus to be perverted by the decision of this court, to become an instrument for the spread of slavery against the will of the people. This necessarily results from the doctrine already advanced, if acquiesced in and carried out to its legitimate consequences.

THE PUBLIC EXPENDITURES.

But I find I am spending so much time upon this slavery question that I am becoming somewhat hoarse, and as I wish to say something to you in regard to the expenditures of the government, and show that the party in power is as false to its other professions as it is to these it has at different times set up on the slavery question, I will pass for a few moments to that subject. The expenses of the government, as you have probably often heard, have increased enormously within a few years. The amount of money at the disposal of government for this year is more than one hundred millions of dollars. This

I know has sometimes been disputed; but I have here the official statement made by the clerk of the House of Representatives, showing that more than eighty-one millions were specifically appropriated at the last session of Congress, and there are indefinite appropriations to pay claims, the precise amount of which is not yet known, which amount, at the lowest estimate to three millions and a half, making over eighty-four millions, and there is an unexpected balance of appropriations made last year, amounting to more than sixteen millions. These sums altogether make more than a hundred millions of dollars at the disposal of the administration for the present fiscal year. I know it is said that it is unfair to charge all this to this year; that a surplus will remain at the end of this year to be carried to the next list; but I think it is much more likely that the administration will come in with a deficiency bill, and ask for some ten millions more, as they did at the last Congress, than that any surplus will remain. The expenses of the government during the administration of General Pierce were \$232,820,632. This is more than all the expenses of the government from 1790, when it was organized, for thirty years together, including the war with Great Britain in 1812. General Pierce expended more money during four years of peace than our government expended for the first thirty years after its organization. In 1823, the expenditures of the government for all purposes, exclusive of the public debt, were \$3,784,154 59. In 1857 the expenses of the government, exclusive of the public debt, were \$65,932,559 76. The *pro rata*, according to the population of 1823, was 94 cents on each individual. The *pro rata* in 1857 was \$2 28 per man—94 cents to \$2 28, according to population. Now these facts ought to attract the attention of the country; but perhaps if I were to state in detail some of the wastefulness of this government—some of the means by which these expenses have been increased, it would strike some minds more forcibly. I will call your attention to the city of Chicago. You have a custom-house located here. In 1852, or for the fiscal year ending in June, 1853, the last year of Fillmore's administration, there was collected at Chicago \$111,803 86. Six men were employed to collect it, and they were paid \$2,892 12. That was a little over two per cent. For the year ending June 30, 1856, there was collected at Chicago \$145,662 40. Sixteen men were employed in its collection, and they were paid \$14,349 29 for doing it. Now I ask you, living right here as you do, is there any reason for this increased expenditure? Can you tell me any reason why it cost ten per cent. the last fiscal year to collect the revenue at this port, and only a little over two per cent. four years ago. Is there any reason for it except that the government wanted to shower the money upon favorites. [Yes, there is a reason.] I don't know what it is. ["The democratic party must be sustained."—Laughter and applause.] I think that is the best reason. [Renewed laughter.] They must sustain the office-holders. But Chicago is only a single case. I have the official report here, and I will state a few other cases to show you how the government expends money. There are some other points where the expenditures for collecting the revenue are much worse than at this point. At Wilmington, Delaware, there was collected in 1857, \$2,004 95. How many men do you suppose it took to collect that amount, and how much do you suppose they got for it? It took eight men, and the expense of collecting was \$15,843 33! [Laughter.] Gentlemen, you began entirely too soon. These are the better sort of cases. At Annapolis, in Maryland, there was collected some year, \$374 25. [Renewed laughter.] How

many men do you suppose it took to collect that? It took four men, and they were paid for their services, \$983 42. At Ocracoke, in North Carolina, \$82 55 were collected in 1857. [Laughter.] It took seven men to do it. [Laughter.] And an economical government, under a democratic administration, priding itself on its economy, paid seven men to collect this \$82 55, the sum of \$2,301 52. [Laughter.] At Port Orford, Oregon Territory—now, you would expect something extravagant over there—there was collected \$5 85, and it took two men to collect it, and they were paid for collecting \$2,703 08. [Great laughter.] Can any of you make the calculation of the per centage that was paid to collect the \$5 85. I believe it was about five hundred to one. Don't you think the government ought to get rich? At Monterey, California, the amount collected in 1857 was \$45 23, three men were employed to collect it, and paid for doing it \$7,050 95. At Buffalo there was collected, in 1857, \$10,140 53. There were ten men employed in its collection, and they were paid \$16,896 51. I will not weary you by reading this report further. It is the official report from the Secretary of the Treasury, in answer to a resolution of the Senate calling upon him to know how many employees he had at the different Custom-houses; what he paid them; how much was collected, &c., and here is the official report from every collection district in the United States. I have singled out a part of them as examples. ["When can we have the report?"] You can have this published, it is a public document. ["Has Douglas got it?"] I presume he has, for he sustains the administration on every point save one. I will now give you some account of the total expense of collecting the revenue for several years past. In 1850 Congress passed a law appropriating \$2,450,000 annually to defray the expenses of collecting the revenue east of the Rocky Mountains. During Taylor's and Fillmore's administration the whole revenue east of the Rocky Mountains was collected for about two million dollars per annum, leaving a surplus of more than \$1,600,000 at the end of the four years. During the four years of the administration of General Pierce he used up the \$2,450,000 per annum and every dollar of the \$1,600,000 remaining over from the Fillmore administration besides. After Mr. Buchanan came into power, Mr. Secretary Cobb, in his first report, asked Congress to appropriate \$3,700,000 annually to collect the revenue in the same district of country where only about \$2,000,000 had been required five years before. What was the reason for this vast increase of expense? None was given. Congress did not appropriate the \$3,700,000 asked for, but it did appropriate \$3,300,000 for collecting the revenue east of the Rocky Mountains. The amount of the revenue collected is less than during Fillmore's administration, when it was collected for \$2,000,000. The reason of this increase is partly because supernumerary officers have been employed. Gen. Pierce added more than three hundred clerks to the Custom House in New York, and I suppose they were paid over \$1,000 apiece—that alone would make \$300,000; and so it was that the average annual expense of collecting the revenue this side of California during the Pierce administration was nearly a million more than during Fillmore's; and during the first year of Buchanan's administration they want \$1,300,000 more to collect the revenue for a single year than it took four years before. Fellow-citizens, are you for continuing this state of things? Does it meet your approbation? ["No, no, no."] Do you not think it would be better to take some of this money, thus squandered upon partisan favorites, to protect your immense commerce, to improve your harbors, and save the lives of your citizens on these

great lakes? [Cries of "Yes, yes."] I suppose that would be unconstitutional in the opinion of the ruling dynasty [laughter], but it is not unconstitutional to pay a man five hundred dollars to collect one. [Laughter.] I could detain you, fellow citizens, for hours in pointing out the extravagances of the past and present administrations, with all their professions of economy. But I have said enough, I trust, to call your attention to the matter. I have stated the gross amount which the government is using per annum, and you will find that for the last five years more money was expended than for the first thirty-five years of the government. The increase of expenditures is many times as great as the increase of population, or the extent of country, and there is no reason for this. But there is not only extravagance in the collection of the revenue, but in all branches of the public service. They are in the habit at Washington of multiplying offices. Judicial districts are divided when there is no cause for it, and when the public service does not require it; and then judges, and marshals and attorneys are appointed, and the expense of courts is incurred. Ports of entry are established when there is no occasion for them, and immense sums of money are lavished upon favorite places in the construction of magnificent palaces. I verily believe that this government can be carried on, and properly carried on, for less than one-half the money now used by this administration professing economy [cheers and loud applause]; and I ask you now if I have not made good the charge that the professions of this party are all false with regard to economy as to freedom. [Cries of "Yes! yes!"] Then I ask you, is it to be sustained? I am satisfied that the people of this country cannot approve of these things. You cannot believe in the professions of men who practice directly the reverse of what they profess. You cannot believe that men are sincerely for economy, when they are plundering the public treasury; and if you don't hurl from power such a party the first opportunity you have, it must be because you fear that those who are to succeed them will do no better. Now, is that so? [Cries of "No! no!"]

WHAT THE REPUBLICAN PARTY PROPOSES.

What does the Republican party propose? I shall detain you but a few minutes upon that point. We propose, upon the slavery question, to leave it exactly where the men who framed the constitution left it. We are for leaving the question of slavery, where it exists in the states, to be regulated by the states as they think proper; and we are for keeping the territories which belong to the United States free from the invasion of slavery so long as they remain territories—[cheers]—leaving them when they become states, of course, to deal with their black population as they shall think best; for we have no power then to interfere with the subject. There is no question what the result will be. If there is no slavery in the territory, there will be none when the people come to make a state. I want to appeal to the candor of those who are honoring me with their attention, whether they be democrats or Republicans—for there are but two parties—it is idle to talk about a third party—a Douglas party, or anything of that kind. There is no middle ground; you must take one side or the other. If you sustain the measures of this self-styled democratic party, you are one of them; if you sustain the measures of the Republican party, you must go with them, and there is no third party to unite with. We wish to ask you, men of all parties, if you are opposed to the introduction of slavery into Illinois. I apprehend that you are—that all this audience will respond with "We are opposed to it." If that is so, you have

your reasons for it. You think it better for the white race that there should be no slavery here; entertaining that view, you will exclude it. Now, is there a father who would do less in the formation of a government for his children and his posterity than he will for himself. Is there an honest man here who can say, "I will exclude slavery from the state and locality where I live, because I believe it an evil; but I will suffer it to go in where my children are to go." Here is a common territory. You are the Congress of the United States. The constitution of the United States says that Congress shall make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territories of the United States. Here is a territory about to be settled; you are called upon to frame a government for the people who are to go there, which is to last so long, and only so long, as the territorial condition continues. Now what sort of government is it your duty to frame? You will readily admit that it is your duty to form such a government as will be for the best interests of the people who are to go there. Is not that so? [Cries of "Yes, yes, that's so."] You believe it to be for your best interests to exclude it from Illinois, where you live. Is it not then for the best interests of your child, and sister, and brother, and neighbor, who are going to the territory, that slavery should not go with them? Will you do less for them than for yourselves? A man is not deserving the name of man who is so selfish that he will protect himself from an evil, yet will not raise his arm, when he has the power, to protect his child and his friend from the same evil. [Great cheers.] Then it is your duty to exclude slavery from that territory until there are people enough there to come to act for themselves. That is exactly what we propose to do, and nothing more. That was what the fathers of the republic did. Is there anything wrong in that? I think if you will look at this matter candidly, you will see that it is right, and that it is your duty to insist upon it. The charge that we want to have anything to do with negroes is utterly untrue. It is a false clamor raised to mislead the public mind. Our policy is to have nothing to do with them; and I, myself, am very much inclined to favor the project suggested by Mr. Blair, of Missouri, at the last session of Congress. He suggested a plan for colonizing our free negroes who are willing to go somewhere in Central America, where an arrangement could be made by which their rights may be secured to them. The policy now is such as to prevent emancipation; and although we do not want to interfere with the domestic institution of slavery in the states, still we wish to interpose no obstacle to the people of those states in getting rid of their slaves whenever they think fit to do so. We know that many of the free states have passed laws prohibiting the emancipation of slaves by their masters, unless they are taken out of the state. The result of this legislation is that emancipation must cease; there are thousands of free negroes in Virginia; but that policy is now stopped, because it is impracticable, there being no way of disposing of the negro when emancipated. Many masters in the South desire to emancipate their slaves, and especially is this the case as they approach death; for, however they may reason while in health, and thoughtless of that event which levels all alike, they are very apt, in making up their last account and disposing of their property, to think of the wrong and injustice they have done by holding some of their fellow-men in bondage, and they are quite willing to emancipate them. Thousands would be emancipated if there was any place to which they could go. *I, for one, am very much disposed to favor the colonization of such*

"free negroes as are willing to go to Central America. I want to have nothing to do either with the free negro or the slave negro. We, the Republican party, are the white man's party. [Great applause.] We are for free white men, and for making white labor respectable and honorable, which it never can be when negro slave labor is brought into competition with it. [Great applause.] We wish to settle the territories with free white men, and we are willing that this negro race should go anywhere that it can to better its condition, wishing them God speed wherever they go. We believe it is better for us that they should not be among us. I believe it will be better for them to go elsewhere.

A Voice—Where to?

Mr. Trumbull—I would say to any Central American state that will make an arrangement by which they can be secure in their rights until they arrive at a time when they can protect and take care of themselves.

A Voice—But if you can't protect them here, how can they be protected in Central America?

Mr. Trumbull—I would colonize them. We colonize Indians on our western frontier; why don't we colonize the negro as well as the Indian? We can suffer them to go off in a country by themselves. This Central American country seems to be adapted to the negro race. It is unhealthy and enervating to the white man. Let the negroes go there if they wish; and I understand there is no objection on the part of the people of portions of Central America to the negroes coming there and enjoying an equality of rights—[applause]—and this would give them an opportunity to improve their condition. I would be glad to see this country relieved of them, believing it better both for them and for us that we should not mingle together. Besides, such an outlet, were it provided, would be the means of freeing thousands who would otherwise be continued in slavery.

DOUGLAS AND "DIVERSITY OF OUR INSTITUTIONS."

I will say a word in regard to the argument, or rather perversion it should be called, I have seen going the rounds of the papers, that if such a state of things should take place—that the states should think proper to emancipate and send their slaves off—it could not be done without producing a uniformity between the institutions of the different states; and that would lead to despotism. It is said that our free institutions rest upon the diversity of laws and institutions in the different states, and it is argued that if there is a uniformity on the subject of freedom there must be uniformity upon every other subject—uniformity of laws for the granite hills of New Hampshire, the rice fields of South Carolina, the mines of California, and the prairies of Illinois. It is difficult to treat so illogical an inference seriously; but if it be true that uniformity on the subject of freedom in all the states requires uniformity of laws upon all subjects in the several states, then diversity upon the one subject would require diversity upon all. On this principle I can prove that the men who advocate it, and who say that diversity is the basis of our free institutions, are themselves in favor of licensing robbers, and burglars, and thieves, and murderers, and repealing all laws for punishing such offenders. And why? Because all the states of the Union have laws for preventing the commission of such crimes; and as diversity of laws is the basis of our free institutions, we must repeal our criminal code in order to bring it about, lest, by having laws in all the states punishing such criminals, we fall into despotism. Now, you who are for diversity of laws and institutions in the different states, must sanction murder, robbery,

burglary and theft, according to your own mode of reasoning. The application of such reasoning is as good one way as the other, and this shows the utter absurdity of charging upon the Republicans—who would wish that in the providence of God, not a human being trod his footstool in the capacity of slave—[loud applause]—a desire to have a uniformity of laws and institutions in all the states on all subjects. I say this, simply turning the argument used against us upon those who make it, and showing that they are just as obnoxious to the charge of advocating diversity of laws and institutions upon all subjects as we are of advocating uniformity upon all.

CONCLUSION.

Having given the views of the Republican party, as I understand them, in regard to slavery, I designed to have said something upon the unwarrantable assumption of power by the federal executive, but am already so much exhausted as to be unable to do so. I intended to have pointed out to you the nature of the assumptions of power on the part of the federal government tending to consolidation and to break down the sovereignty of the states; to have shown, as it can be shown and demonstrated, that this party, now calling itself democratic, is the old federal party in disguise. ["Go on," "Good, good," "Go on," and applause.] It is true, and it can be demonstrated to be true. The powers which have been usurped by Pierce and Buchanan would have led to the impeachment, I believe, of Washington himself. [Applause.] Why, the President of the United States now assumes to raise armies without calling upon Congress. He has enlisted volunteers without the least authority from Congress. He has marched an army away to the Rocky Mountains, and encamped it there during the winter at an expense of millions and millions of dollars, without the least authority of law. But all that a democratic Congress does is to raise the money to pay for the expedition. I say nothing here of the impolicy of that expedition; I speak of the want of power in the President to send it there. It is done, I know, under the pretended name of a *posse comitatus* to accompany the Governor. It is the same sort of subterfuge under which troops were employed in Kansas to compel submission to its invaders. You know what a *posse comitatus* is. It is the power of the county, called out by a civil officer to assist in the execution of process when resisted, and the President of the United States, who has no authority to summon a *posse* for any purpose, calls the army from Florida, thousands of miles off, and sends it as a *posse comitatus* first to Kansas, afterwards to the Rocky Mountains to accompany the governor. Why, a governor has no right to have a *posse comitatus* for an escort, and it is a perversion of terms to give such a name to an army. The authority to make war is vested by the constitution in the Congress of the United States. It is expressly declared that Congress shall have power to declare war, to raise armies, and prescribe rules for their government.

A Voice.—How will you put down rebellion?

Mr. Trumbull—I will put down rebellion under the authority of Congress, and in no other way. [Applause.] The President of the United States is the commander-in-chief, when Congress raises the troops and directs him what to do, but he has no power to raise an army; and if you sanction his usurpations of power in raising armies and using them at his discretion, the time is not distant when some Bonaparte or Caesar will assume to control your rights and mine. [Great cheers.] The Republican party is opposed to this assumption of

power, and all these unnecessary offices and unnecessary expenses, and they are for bringing the government back, not only in regard to this slavery question, but in regard to all questions, to its original policy under Washington and Jefferson. We are for an economical administration of the government, for shaping the legislation of the country to serve the best interests of the country, and the whole country—oppressing no section and no interest, but doing justice to all; [cries of “good, good,” and loud applause:] not interfering with slavery where it is, but shaping the policy of the country so

as to prevent its expansion, and leaving it as the constitution has left it—for the states where it exists to manage it shall seem to them best. [Applause.] That I understand to be the policy of the Republican party. Install that party in power, and we may look forward to long years of peace and prosperity, for a free, a united and a happy people. [Loud and long continued cheering.]

As Mr. Trumbull retired, three cheers were called for by a voice in the crowd, and responded to by thousands of voices with great enthusiasm.



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 012 025 939 8